United Nations A/C.2/71/SR.29

General Assembly
Seventy-first session
Official Records

Distr.: General
20 January 2017

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 29th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 13 December 2016, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Djani ..... (Indonesia)

Contents

Agenda item18: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of the International Conferences on Financing for Development (*continued*)

Agenda item 20: Implementation of the outcomes of the United Nations Conferences on Human Settlements and on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) (*continued*)

Agenda item 24: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

(a) Operational activities for development of the United Nations system (*continued*)

Agenda item 17: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(c) External debt sustainability and development (*continued*)

Agenda item 23: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the Second United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2008-2017)

Agenda item 25: Agriculture development, food security and nutrition (*continued*)

Agenda item 135: Programme planning

Agenda item 121: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

Completion of the Committee's work

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Management Section (dms@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).

16-22092 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

Agenda item 18: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of the International Conferences on Financing for Development (*continued*)
(A/C.2/71/L.32 and A/C.2/71/L.62)

Draft resolutions entitled "Follow-up and implementation of the outcomes of the International Conferences on Financing for Development"
(A/C.2/71/L.32 and A/C.2/71/L.62)

1. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.62, submitted by Mr. Andambi (Kenya), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.32.The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

2. **Mr. Torrington** (Guyana), facilitator, said that in order to preserve the hard-earned consensus on the draft resolution, the document for adoption should revert in all aspects back to the draft placed under the no-objection procedure. Several well-intentioned but unauthorized amendments had been made and should be corrected. In the third line of paragraph 4, the word "remaining" should be replaced by "staying" to align with the language of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development. In the second line of paragraph 7, "shall" should be replaced by "are to be". In the seventh line of paragraph 8, the words "inter alia" should be reinserted after the word "including". In the fourth line of paragraph 12, the draft resolution should revert verbatim to the agreed text and read "there will be no report".

3. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.62, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

4. **Mr. Plasai** (Thailand), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that financing for development was of crucial importance for the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. The mobilization of resources to address the persistent challenge of poverty and underdevelopment both within and among countries would be fundamental to achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

5. The Group was disappointed and deeply concerned about the future of the agenda item and the working spirit of the Second Committee. At the beginning of negotiations on the draft resolution, development partners had refused to engage on the original draft proposal submitted by the Group of 77 and China, and some development partners had walked out of discussions during informal consultations.. Such negative conduct could not set a precedent for the future work of the Committee. The efforts and hard work of the Group of 77 and China during long consultations on preparation of the draft text should be valued and respected.

6. Compromise had been reached in various key areas; there nonetheless remained a number of issues of principle that were fully endorsed by the Group that had not been adequately accommodated in the current version of the draft resolution, including but not limited to official development assistance (ODA), which remained an essential form of financing for development for developing countries. All ODA commitments should be fulfilled; he urged those countries that had not met their targets to make additional efforts to reverse the trend of declining ODA to least developed countries, many of which continued to rely on concessional finance to meet sustainable development needs. The Group of 77 and China was disappointed that the adopted draft resolution did not reflect the Group's long-term interests and positions regarding financing for development.

7. The report by the Secretary-General on the implementation of the draft resolution was an important political tool for Member States to obtain information on the follow-up to and implementation of the outcomes of financing for development conferences. The Group was of the view that the establishment of the Inter-agency Task Force on Financing for Development did not negate the continued relevance of the report of the Secretary-General on that topic, as the Inter-Agency Task Force report would not specifically take into account issues raised prior to the Addis Ababa Action Agenda but remained relevant to discussions on financing for development. In addition, it would focus primarily on progress in the implementation of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the means of implementation of the 2030 Agenda. The Secretary-General had issued his report on the subject annually since the adoption of the Monterrey Consensus of the International Conference on Financing for Development. That tradition must be preserved in order for the Second Committee to continue its deliberations on financing for development follow-up outcomes. The Secretary-General's report would also provide an opportunity to evaluate and review the means of implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

8. The Group did not see a conflict between the report of the Secretary-General and that of the Inter-agency Task Force. The report of the Secretary-General provided political guidance and complemented

the Inter-agency Task Force report without creating any duplication. As the financing for development process was a work in progress, all reports were essential inputs. The Group had therefore reluctantly agreed to forgo the request for the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the implementation of the resolution, given the extremely difficult nature of the negotiations. However, the outcome of draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.62 must not set a precedent for any future resolutions on the issue or any related matters.

9. **Ms. Adamson** (Observer for the European Union), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, as well as Australia, Canada, Israel, Japan, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea, Switzerland and the United States of America, expressed support for reverting to the original language of the draft resolution.

10. She said that the European Union and its member States, as well as the countries she had just named, interpreted paragraph 7 to mean that the draft resolution before the Committee did not include any decisions regarding the Economic and Social Council forum on financing for development follow-up. Furthermore, paragraph 12 did not pre-empt any discussions in 2017 on the same resolution, especially with regard to the status of the report of the Secretary-General. Now that the Inter-agency Task Force report would be available yearly, there would be no need for another report on financing for development to be presented to the Committee.

11. She expressed deep concern regarding interference by the United Nations Secretariat in the Member State process, which had almost thwarted consensus on the draft resolution by providing unsolicited advice to some Member States during the no-objection period, with the intention of influencing the outcome. The fact that compromise had ultimately prevailed only confirmed her delegation's trust in the professional and constructive nature of intergovernmental negotiations among Member States.

12. **Mr. Ngundze** (South Africa) said that the manner in which the negotiations had been conducted did not augur well for the implementation of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, especially with regard to development partners. The draft resolution had only come into being thanks to the utmost flexibility shown by the Group of 77 and China, but had been substantially weakened in the process, doing a great disservice to financing for development and millions of people worldwide, as well as further widening the gap between North and South. The international community must redirect its focus towards realizing meaningful follow-up and review of financing for development outcomes, as well as of the means of implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

13. He stressed the urgent need for universal political will to engage in open discussions on all seven action areas of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and address systemic issues. Such matters were not the sole mandate of the forum on financing for development follow-up: as the Addis Ababa Action Agenda did not make distinctions in terms of which United Nations bodies should discuss financing for development matters, the Second Committee must proactively engage in guiding and complementing the Economic and Social Council.

14. He expressed grave concern that the Secretary-General would not be requested to submit a report during the seventy second session. Such a decision should be discouraged in future, as it did not bode well for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. The report of the Secretary-General remained a crucial political tool that clarified the significance of various agenda items and should therefore be preserved. All Member States were urged to start preparing for the 2019 follow-up conference referred to in paragraph 134 of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. The report of the Secretary-General, as well as the draft resolution now before the Committee, would be of crucial assistance in the preparations for a successful conference on financing for development in 2019. All international efforts must be directed at defeating the triple scourge of poverty, unemployment and inequality, while providing frank answers to developing countries to explain the lack of progress thus far.

15. **Mr. Tiare** (Burkina Faso), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, said that the agenda item in question remained of critical importance for Africa, which still lagged far behind other regions in terms of development. The international community must focus its efforts on achieving development for all countries, leaving no one behind. In that regard, the General Assembly must be authorized to continue providing political guidance to the forum on financing for development follow-up to help it fulfil its mandate in a more coordinated manner.

16. Poverty eradication should be at the centre of all international efforts, prevailing over divisive issues that impeded economic development in developing countries, particularly in Africa; financing for development remained a critical question in that regard. ODA remained crucial in order for Africa, which had the greatest number of least developed countries, to meet development challenges. The

African Group thanked those developed countries that had fulfilled their ODA commitments and urged all others to do the same.

17. The Second Committee must be able to provide insight on the seven action areas of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda through pertinent follow-up and review of financing for development outcomes as well as the means of implementation of the 2030 Agenda. The Group of African countries hoped that all commitments made within the context of international financing for development conferences, including the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, would be fulfilled in a timely manner in order to help Africa implement the 2030 Agenda.

18. Agenda 2063: The Africa We Want and its First Ten-Year Implementation Plan 2014-2023 had been adopted on the African continent to achieve economic growth; the Plan would be incredibly difficult to realize without financial resources, however. The African Group therefore called on the United Nations to provide multilateral support for the capacity-building and institutional development necessary to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals.

19. The African Group was deeply concerned that the Secretary-General would not be submitting a report on the agenda item during the seventy-second session of the General Assembly. It hoped that that would not become a practice, as the Secretary-General's reports had been an important political tool since the adoption of the Monterrey Consensus. As 2016 had been the first year of implementation of several landmark international agreements, it had been a year of trial and error. Looking ahead, the Group called for solidarity in the fight to definitively eradicate poverty in all its forms and dimensions in Africa.

20. **Mr. Sandoval Mendiolea** (Mexico) said that while his delegation commended the flexible spirit of negotiations that had made it possible to strike a delicate balance, it was nonetheless crucial to go beyond short-term visions and move forward with the implementation of the goals of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. One year after the adoption of that landmark agreement, efforts should focus on implementation, adopting a cross-cutting and multidimensional approach to the financing agenda and identifying the different sources of both financial and non-financial resources needed to ensure the proper implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

21. All Member States must remain flexible in order to face new challenges and avoid the duplication of mandates in implementing the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the 2030 Agenda. The restructuring of mandates would be a painful but necessary process to promote the higher interests of the United Nations system for the global good over national and thematic interests. While resistance to change was natural, the international community must fight against inertia and adopt any necessary changes proposed by the Secretary-General.

22. His delegation was committed to ensuring the success of the forum on financing for development follow-up in 2017. It was also committed to maintaining a constructive approach, with consensus as its guiding force.

23. **Ms. Ravilova-Borovik** (Russian Federation) said that the draft resolution just adopted was based on a complex compromise. All participants fully realized what that compromise entailed and how important it was to preserve unity of views on the ways in which financing for development would be addressed in the future.

24. The comment by the representative of the European Union with regard to the Secretariat gave cause for concern. Having participated directly in the informal consultations on the draft from start to finish, her delegation wished to note the timely, professional and impartial nature of the briefings and clarifications provided by the relevant offices of the Secretariat in response to requests from Member States. The Secretariat had adhered unwaveringly to the spirit of cooperation that had existed for years between Member States and the Secretariat. The Russian Federation called for the constructive atmosphere of cooperation between the Secretariat and Member States to be preserved. Trust of long standing should not be sacrificed on the altar of hasty conclusions.

25. *A/C.2/71/L.32 was withdrawn.*

Oral decision on the report of the Secretary-General entitled "Supporting the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development (A/71/534)

26. **The Chair** proposed that the Committee should take note of the report of the Secretary-General entitled "Supporting the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development" as contained in document A/71/534.

27. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 20: Implementation of the outcomes of the United Nations Conferences on Human Settlements and on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.36 and A/C.2/71/L.59)

Draft resolutions entitled "Implementation of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (Habitat III) and strengthening of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat)" (A/C.2/71/L.36 and A/C.2/71/L.59)

28. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.59, submitted by Mr. Seoane (Peru), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.36.

29. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement of programme budget implications in connection with draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.59 in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure, drew attention to paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, pursuant to which, starting in 2018, the annual report to the Economic and Social Council on the "coordinated implementation of the Habitat Agenda" would be replaced by a quadrennial report on the "Implementation of the New Urban Agenda" to be produced every four years thereafter. The annual report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly on the activities of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) would continue to be produced on an annual basis.

30. Referring to paragraphs 161, 162 and 166-168 of the New Urban Agenda, she outlined the reporting requirements and criteria. UN-Habitat currently prepared an annual report to the General Assembly that provided a description of its activities to implement the outcome of the second United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) and strengthen UN-Habitat but did not report on the overall implementation of the Habitat Agenda. Information and data collected for the report to the General Assembly were an important basis for the report to the Economic and Social Council; however, the report to the Council focused largely on United Nations support to the implementation of the Habitat Agenda and did not constitute an overall report on its implementation. Reporting on the progress of the implementation of the New Urban Agenda pursuant to paragraph 5 of the draft resolution would therefore entail additional resources in order to support a substantively different form of reporting for UN-Habitat. The report would highlight selected, rather than comprehensive, components of the New Urban Agenda, and would incorporate data and information on other internationally agreed goals and targets relevant to sustainable urbanization and human settlements, such as the Sustainable Development Goals. It would be based on the collection and analysis of secondary data from documented sources from Member States, UN-Habitat publications and field operations, and from other United Nations agencies at the appropriate level; the report would also incorporate input from targeted consultations with Member States, local authorities and key stakeholders.

31. The change from an annual to a quadrennial cycle of reporting to the Council would lead to a reduction of US$37,600 in requirements for documentation services for the biennium 2018-2019. Should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, total net additional requirements in the amount of US$559,400, comprising an additional requirement of US$597,000 under section 15, Human settlements, and a reduction in requirements of US$37,600 under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management, would be included in the context of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019. The adoption of the draft resolution would not give rise to any budgetary implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

32. **Ms. Parkash** (Singapore), facilitator, said that the draft resolution took the important step of operationalizing some of the critical agreements reached in the New Urban Agenda, including the request for the Secretary-General to report on the progress of the New Urban Agenda every four years.

33. She introduced two oral corrections in paragraph 9 to align the language with what had been previously agreed: in the fourth line, the word "and" should be inserted between "sustainable economic growth" and "achieve gender equality"; and in the fifth line, a comma should be inserted after "women and girls".

34. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.59, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

35. **Mr. Cadena** (Ecuador) speaking in explanation of position, said that his delegation had joined consensus on the draft resolution, recognizing that the timely implementation of the outcomes of Habitat III were crucial to achieve sustainable development for all. It had been a great honour for his country to host the Conference. Nonetheless, Ecuador was disappointed that the text did not reflect, in its

preambular section, several substantive elements that had been contained previously. In addition, the current draft had unfortunately only been circulated on 22 November and had not yet been analysed by the Fifth Committee.

36. Ecuador had received nothing but thanks from its counterparts for the success of the Conference and the welcoming nature of the Ecuadorian people. The original draft resolution had expressed profound gratitude to the Government and people of Ecuador for hosting the Habitat III Conference and providing all the necessary support. The version of the draft resolution now before the Committee was therefore insufficient, insofar as it did not recognize the exceptional openness of the Ecuadorian people, as illustrated by a recent study conducted by the University of Michigan, which had determined that Ecuador was the country with the greatest empathy for cultural diversity in the world.

37. **Ms. Mendelson** (United States of America) said that her delegation was disappointed that for the fourth time in five years, it had been forced to protest budget costs and express concern over estimates provided by UN-Habitat regarding the budgetary implications of the resolution on human settlements. Although the adoption of the New Urban Agenda had marked a historic achievement, the contentious issue of its follow-up and review had only been resolved through a delicate compromise, premised on the understanding of all those who had participated in negotiations that the quadrennial report to be coordinated by UN-Habitat would be cost-neutral, owing to the elimination of an annual report by the Economic and Social Council. The estimates presented were therefore substantially out of line with the expectations of Member States.

38. The United States had been a consistent supporter of UN-Habitat and its work towards sustainable urbanization. Unfortunately, such action by UN-Habitat reinforced already heightened concerns by Member States regarding the entity's ability to realistically plan and manage its resources in a cost-effective manner. The New Urban Agenda had not tasked UN-Habitat with conducting costly, primary data collection or research, but merely with coordinating the compilation of secondary data drawn from existing reports or collected via tailored questionnaires. The cost estimates presented by the Secretariat should not prejudge the submission by the Secretary-General to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, and discussions by Member States in the Fifth Committee for the 2018-2019 biennium should not be perceived as having the endorsement of Member States.

39. **Mr. Sekiguchi** (Japan), speaking also on behalf of Canada, said that the New Urban Agenda was action-oriented and provided a comprehensive picture of sustainable urbanization over the next 20 years. His country was ready to implement it along with the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda. The draft resolution was a first step towards the implementation of the New Urban Agenda and Japan welcomed the consensus agreement reached. However, an agreement by Member States should be implemented as agreed and should not be interpreted by any United Nations entity in a manner different from or contrary to the will of Member States. Therefore, the oral statement of the Secretariat was out of line with agreed language by Member States in paragraphs 166 to 168 of the New Urban Agenda and the footnotes, from which it was clear that the report was intended to be cost-neutral. The New Urban Agenda expected UN-Habitat to compile information from existing United Nations entities or relevant institutions; it should not be conducting costly primary data collection research. The oral statement by the Secretariat should not prejudge any future discussions on the regular budget for the 2018-2019 biennium. The breakdowns and estimates would be studied in detail in due course.

40. **Ms. Adamson** (Observer for the European Union), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the New Urban Agenda was the cornerstone for the implementation and localization of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Other milestones had been the Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. The New Urban Agenda reflected the European Union's vision of sustainable urban development that took into account the diversity of cities and their wider territorial context while building on urban-rural linkages. The New Urban Agenda recognized the importance of cross-sectoral cooperation and knowledge exchange among cities as well as the central role of culture alongside the availability of quality human space, with a human rights-based approach at its core.

41. She expressed the support of the European Union and its member States for a report on the implementation of the New Urban Agenda, which would contribute to the follow-up and review process of the 2030 Agenda. She therefore welcomed strong United Nations system-wide coordination in the preparation of the progress report that would feed into the high-level political forum. The European Union's ambition for the New Urban Agenda and the report on

its implementation went hand in hand with expectations in terms of cost-effectiveness. In that regard, the preliminary estimates of programme budgetary implications gave cause for concern. The follow-up and review process was to be voluntary and country-led, and the report coordinated by UN-Habitat was to build on voluntary inputs from countries and relevant regional and international organizations, with UN-Habitat stakeholders analysing qualitative and quantitative data in the form of secondary data from countries and stakeholder organizations, avoiding duplication and building on existing information. The report was intended to replace the Secretary-General's annual report, meaning that resources previously allocated to that report should henceforth be used to prepare the quadrennial progress report. Similarly, UN-Habitat should leverage the potential for synergies with existing UN-Habitat reports. The independent assessment would contribute to reform of UN-Habitat and help it to adapt to the New Urban Agenda. She called for constructive discussions on the future of UN-Habitat on the basis of the recommendations made in that assessment.

42. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.36 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 24: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

(a) Operational activities for development of the United Nations system (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.37 and A/C.2/71/L.63)

Draft resolutions on operational activities for development of the United Nations system (A/C.2/71/L.37 and A/C.2/71/L.63)

43. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.63 entitled "Quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system" (A/C.2/71/L.63), submitted by Mr. Seoane (Peru), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.37. He commended delegations for their hard work over many days and nights of negotiations on the draft text, and for their cooperation and flexibility, allowing for the no-objection period to expire and for the Committee to take action on a consensus text. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

44. **Mr. Randin** (Switzerland), facilitator, said that despite a critical mass of topics, the text of the draft resolution remained short and concise, and was about half the length of the 2012 resolution.

45. **Mr. Roet** (Israel) proposed the deletion of the words "countries and peoples under foreign occupation" in paragraph 10, saying that they amounted to including country-specific political language. Attempts to politicize Second Committee resolutions were an unfortunate distraction from the work of the Committee.

46. **Mr. Plasai** (Thailand), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, called for a motion not to consider the proposed amendment on the basis of rule 120 of the rules of procedure.

47. **Ms. Herity** (Secretary of the Committee) said that, according to rule 120, as a general rule, no proposal should be discussed or put to the vote at any meeting of the Committee unless copies of it had been circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting. The Chair might, however, permit the discussion and consideration of amendments, or of motions as to procedure, even though such amendments and motions had not been circulated or had only been circulated the same day.

48. **Mr. Plasai** (Thailand), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group of 77 and China maintained its call for a motion not to consider the proposed amendment on the basis of rule 120.

The meeting was suspended at 4.35 p.m. and resumed at 5.50 p.m.

49. **Mr. Plasai** (Thailand), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that, having considered the Chair's statement and following consultations, the Group of 77 and China instead requested a vote on the proposal made by Israel.

50. **Mr. Abbas** (Lebanon) said that his delegation supported the call for a vote.

51. **Mr. Bolaji** (Nigeria) said that his delegation also supported the call for a vote and noted the magnanimity of the Chair of the Group of 77 and China. A vote would relieve the Second Committee of a great deal of difficulty. At the same time, he wondered why it was necessary to deny the obvious by calling for a vote or asking for a deletion in paragraph 10.

52. **Ms. Mendelson** (United States of America), speaking also on behalf of Australia and Canada in explanation of vote before the voting, said that it was frustrating that the reference to "countries and peoples under foreign occupation", language that had been agreed to by all Heads of State in the 2030 Agenda, had not been accepted. She wondered whether the wider group was aware of other options, including four

examples of previously agreed language on foreign occupation in the previous 15 months. The political issues being discussed were important but should not be allowed to undermine the work of the Second Committee. Going forward, such discussions should not further weaken the Second Committee as a venue for substantive discussions of issues that affected the lives of millions of people. By voting "yes", her delegation merely wished to prevent the language in paragraph 10 from setting a precedent for inclusion in future Second Committee resolutions.

53. **Ms. Engelbrecht Schadtler** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation supported the proposal made by the delegation of Thailand on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, but it was regrettable that, after many hours of negotiations, and a no-objection procedure under which no delegation had come forth to express its views, the current situation had arisen.

54. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Australia, Canada, Israel, Palau, United States of America.

Against:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Georgia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Sudan, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

55. *The proposed oral amendment to paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.63 was rejected by 115 votes to 5, with 45 abstentions.*

56. **Ms. Simonyan** (Armenia) said that the quadrennial comprehensive policy review would lead to a more comprehensive and integrated development agenda and a better response to system-wide issues. The commitment of the United Nations development system to strengthening coherence, transparency and accountability was encouraging. The formulation of the landmark resolution just adopted had been an important test of multilateralism; the text of the draft resolution gave due consideration to the needs of countries facing special challenges, including landlocked developing countries and middle-income countries. However, it was regrettable that politically sensitive language had been included even though it not only failed to reflect the purposes of the draft resolution but also lacked preciseness as to the scope of its relevance and applicability. The language could have been made genuinely consensual. For that reason, her delegation had abstained in the vote.

57. The 2030 Agenda recognized the need for people to be at the centre of sustainable development without distinction of any kind. The quadrennial comprehensive policy review had a vital role to play in promoting a people-centred approach to the realization of the Sustainable Development Goals and should focus on those in greatest need, regardless of geography.

58. **Mr. Roet** (Israel) said that his country attached great importance to the resolution because of its significance in outlining the core function of the United Nations development system in light of the 2030 Agenda. That core function should be clearly

defined in order to support development efforts around the world.

59. His delegation and others had worked tirelessly to find an acceptable compromise and shown great flexibility. Regrettably, their counterparts had shown zero flexibility or interest in reaching an agreement, and had even employed deceitful tactics that had led to the failure of the negotiations. It was regrettable that, after weeks of negotiations, it had been decided to revert to the original language of paragraph 10, which was why his delegation had had no choice but to call for an amendment. It was unfortunate that the Group of 77 and China had allowed its own resolutions to be hijacked and jeopardized by a certain member of the Group, which had repeatedly attempted to politicize the Committee and create divisions between Groups. Such tactics and the mindset of a majority imposing its will on the rest had sadly become commonplace and adversely affected the quality of the Committee's work.

60. His delegation had made countless concessions to avoid reaching the stage in which the Committee found itself. Regarding the question of whether the language was country-specific, it would be interesting to know why it had been promoted by only one delegation. During the negotiations, the leadership of the Group of 77 and China had been asked to provide the list of countries that the draft resolution discussed but had not been willing to do that. To those who would fault Israel for submitting an amendment and taking up time, his response was that years of allowing the United Nations to be politicized had made the absurd seem acceptable. The fault lay with those who chose to turn the Second Committee into an alternative Security Council. Israel was committed to ending the conflict and achieving peace, and there were many venues to deal with country-specific resolutions and to discuss the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, but the Second Committee was not one of them.

61. Those who had paid the highest price were the majority of the Group of 77 and China who had worked hard over many months only to see their work undermined by members of their own Group, sometimes even unbeknownst to them. He asked friendly members of the Group of 77 and China whether they had been consulted on the decision to refuse agreed language, and whether it was really in their national interest to vote on country-specific language that did not belong in the Second Committee. Such behaviour should not be tolerated. The work of the Committee should be about substance, not political quarrels; delivery, not process; and people, not bureaucracy in line with the statement made by the incoming Secretary-General the day before. In conclusion, he said that Israel remained committed to working with other delegations to advance the work of the Second Committee and the implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

62. **The Chair** invited the Committee to consider adoption of the draft resolution as a whole.

63. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.63 was adopted.*

64. **Mr. Plasai** (Thailand), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, expressed concern that a vote had had to be taken in connection with a draft resolution that would provide the United Nations system with long-term strategic guidance to enable it to adapt its work to the new global development landscape under the 2030 Agenda, as well as other intergovernmentally agreed development commitments. He said that there had been an opportunity to reach consensus, but under the no-objection procedure, no delegation had raised concerns that could have been addressed in a timely manner before the draft resolution was considered for adoption. However, a delegation had called for an amendment, thereby disregarding the fabric of multilateralism, namely the need to make every effort to build consensus. Attempting to address a delegation's concern in a procedural manner by placing a caveat on a text on which no objections had been raised was inadmissible and even disrespectful to all other delegations that had respected the procedure of work. It was even more unacceptable that the vote had been called for by the very delegation that had not been present during most of the negotiation process. The system could not be asked to deliver in a coordinated and coherent manner when delegations themselves were not capable of speaking with a collective voice.

65. The vote that had just taken place was on an amendment regarding the very draft resolution that called on the United Nations system to support Member States in their efforts to implement the 2030 Agenda, which was supposed to be universal and integrated. The quadrennial comprehensive policy review was a development resolution and it was disappointing that the vote had been motivated by political considerations. The Group of 77 and China was extremely concerned that the Second Committee's consideration of the draft resolution had had to take place in political circumstances. However, it reaffirmed its non-politicized principle that, in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, the United Nations development system should address the special challenges facing developing countries, in particular African countries, least developed countries, landlocked developing

countries and small island developing States, and the need to devote special attention to countries in conflict and post-conflict situations, countries and peoples under foreign occupation, and middle-income countries, in line with the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the 2030 Agenda. That was the unified position of the Group. It was therefore incomprehensible and absurd that only one year after the United Nations had pledged to leave no one behind, countries had found it necessary to call for a vote on a paragraph that spoke to the challenges of all those most in need of assistance, on the basis of pure political reasoning.

66. All parties to negotiations should usually gain something and lose something. Regarding the quadrennial comprehensive policy review resolution, it was in the best interests of Member States to provide consensual and collective strategic guidance to the United Nations development system as the implementation of the 2030 Agenda began. Furthermore, the operational activities for development of the United Nations development system should take into account the need to build and promote the capacity of developing countries in their efforts to address long-term sustainable development at the national level, while emphasizing the importance of national ownership and leadership, and bearing in mind the differing development levels and realities on the ground. For the system to be able to do so, its effectiveness, efficiency, coordination, coherence and impact should be improved.

67. Thus, in paragraph 14, which was and must be development-focused, the mere mention of humanitarian crises was not justifiable. When discussing humanitarian emergencies, the notions of "national ownership" and "at the request of countries or Governments" must be included and could not be omitted. In addition, the call for better coordination between development, humanitarian and peacebuilding activities had already been captured in the seventh preambular paragraph and paragraph 24. Therefore, paragraph 14 not only failed to add value to the draft resolution but also brought in language that went beyond the scope of the resolution itself. Regarding paragraph 20, the contributions of the entities of the United Nations development system, in particular its funds and programmes, must aim to provide support to Member States in their efforts to implement the 2030 Agenda, including service delivery, and the development of national capacities, in line with their respective national priorities and plans, without prejudice to funding modalities. It was appalling that a paragraph relating to the mainstreaming of the 2030 Agenda had been used to insert a funding proposal that had been repeatedly rejected by the Group of 77 and China. The so-called alignment of funding with functions was not supported by the majority of delegations. The questions raised on the desirability, feasibility and impact of such a proposal remained unanswered. The Group's flexibility in reaching an agreement on a non-exhaustive list of instruments used by the system to support capacity development had always been accompanied by statements during negotiations that funding was a separate issue. It was therefore unfortunate that such a confusing message had made its way into that paragraph, thereby placing the system in a straitjacket.

68. Regarding paragraph 57 (g) on cost-sharing for the resident coordinator system, the adoption of the draft resolution should not prejudge or interfere with the work of the Fifth Committee, which was currently considering that matter. He called for a more coherent and coordinated United Nations development system that could deliver results both on the ground and at all other levels in support of national ownership and leadership in the efforts to implement the 2030 Agenda in the years ahead.

69. **Ms. Adamson** (Observer for the European Union), speaking in explanation of position, said that the quadrennial comprehensive policy review was an important instrument for strategic guidance of the United Nations development system in the 2030 Agenda era. The actions called for in the draft resolution should help to enhance the system's governance and financing architecture. The draft resolution also sent a clear message regarding critically important cross-cutting issues, including gender equality, the empowerment of women and human rights. However, paragraph 15 inappropriately focused only on the right to development. It was worrying that, despite the adoption of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the discourse relating to financing issues in the Second Committee remained deeply rooted in the outdated division between donor and recipient countries. It was hard to comprehend why it continued to be difficult to refer to development effectiveness when greater effectiveness would benefit programme countries and allow the system to deliver better on its objectives.

70. She welcomed the emphasis in paragraph 24 on the need for stronger and more coherent interaction between the United Nations development system and humanitarian actors but said that the text should also have stressed that humanitarian assistance must be provided in accordance with humanitarian principles. In addition, the statement in that paragraph regarding the maintenance of peace was unjustified and

misleading; development work could contribute to building and sustaining peace not only in countries in conflict or post-conflict situations, but in all countries affected by conflict. As to paragraph 10, the European Union and its member States were fully aware of the complexity of the issue of foreign occupation and of the concerns the issue raised for the various delegations. While they respected those concerns, it was their view that the issue should not divert attention away from the main focus of the Committee's remit: the promotion of sustainable development.

71. Lastly, the European Union and its member States underlined the importance of full implementation and respect for the cost-sharing arrangement for the resident coordinator system and urged the Fifth Committee to approve the agreed contribution by the Department of Economic and Social Affairs during the current session.

72. **Mr. Sharif** (Sudan), speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States, said that the draft resolution addressed a number of the Group's concerns. In particular, the insertion into paragraph 10 of language about special attention to countries and peoples under foreign occupation was consistent with the 2030 Agenda's goal of leaving no one behind. The Group of 77 and China had advocated the addition of that language in order to ensure that countries and peoples under foreign occupation were included among the vulnerable categories that needed special assistance. The negotiations had been difficult, but the consensus that had been reached meant that United Nations agencies would have greater freedom to assist countries and peoples under foreign occupation. It was unfortunate that the usual countries had objected to the language on the grounds that it was political, which could not have been further from the case. He hoped that the language would be built on in future resolutions relating to implementation of the sustainable development agenda.

73. **Ms. Leyva Regueira** (Cuba) said that the draft resolution should be implemented in strict accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and with international law. The entities of the United Nations development system should carry out their actions in the field with full respect for the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and non-interference in the internal affairs of States. With regard to paragraphs 14 and 56, her delegation recognized the multidimensional nature of the causes of conflicts, but at the same time wished to emphasize that the work of the United Nations development system should be guided by the aim of combating the primary root cause of conflicts, namely extreme poverty. Assistance in humanitarian emergencies should be provided with full respect for the principles of neutrality, impartiality and humanity and in conformity with General Assembly resolution 46/182. National consent for the receipt of any type of humanitarian assistance was imperative.

74. **Ms. Mendelson** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, which provided important strategic guidance to the United Nations system for the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals. In particular, it set out ways to improve inter-agency coordination, reduce duplication and overlap and achieve greater operational effectiveness and efficiency. Her delegation fully supported the draft resolution's call for the entities of the United Nations development system, where appropriate, to adopt resource and results frameworks as part of their strategic plans, thus better linking resources to results and enabling agencies to make results-based decisions on resource aliocation.

75. Her delegation encouraged Member States to continue to advocate for strong coordination of development, humanitarian and peacebuilding efforts at the country level. It recognized the importance of national ownership and national priorities and agreed that humanitarian assistance should be delivered on the basis of need. However, in the context of a humanitarian crisis, the needs of affected populations should take precedence over other considerations, even if that meant that a principled needs-based approach was at odds with national priorities. The United Nations and other organizations must be given the room to respond when the context so demanded. Member States had missed the opportunity to incorporate in the draft resolution strong language supporting assistance and protection for internally displaced persons in the context of humanitarian assistance. The draft resolution should have called upon States to find durable solutions for both internally displaced persons and refugees.

76. Lastly, her delegation reiterated its longstanding concerns about the existence of a right to development. There was no agreed international understanding of the concept, and any discussion of rights relating to development should focus on human rights that were recognized by the international community as universal rights which every individual could demand from his or her Government.

77. **Ms. Wilson** (Australia), speaking in explanation of position on behalf of Canada, New Zealand and her

own country, said that, while the title of the draft resolution had remained the same as in previous years, its content had been reinvigorated as a tool for reform. Canada, Australia and New Zealand were pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution, which had the 2030 Agenda as its guiding priority and the implementation of reform as its clearest mandate. The text also underlined the importance of human rights, gender equality and principles of development effectiveness. In addition, it clearly recognized the nexus between peacebuilding, humanitarian assistance and development work; reinforced existing mandates and protections on which such work rested; and promoted practices such as joint risk analysis and needs assessments aimed at reducing need, vulnerability and risk over time and thereby fostering longer-term development outcomes.

78. Canada, Australia and New Zealand took paragraph 24 to mean that humanitarian assistance should in all cases be provided in compliance with international law and with General Assembly resolution 46/182, with full respect for the principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence, and, wherever possible, in a way that was supportive of national plans and priorities, consistent with existing General Assembly resolutions on the matter. The three countries also supported the concept of a right to development that placed the individual at its core, as both the main participant in and the main beneficiary of development. While they agreed that it was the primary responsibility of States to ensure the fulfilment of any right to development, they continued to have reservations regarding any consideration of a legally binding instrument on the right to development and therefore questioned the characterization of the right to development in paragraph 15 as a universal and inalienable right and an integral part of fundamental human rights. Rather than seeking to elevate any right in that manner, it would be better for the international community to focus on developing and sharing best practices, as well as strengthening existing initiatives.

79. **Mr. Bolaji** (Nigeria) said that he wished to make it clear that his delegation's decision to support the retention of the reference in paragraph 10 to countries and peoples under foreign occupation was not an attempt to politicize the work of the Second Committee, nor should it be seen as a sign of any hostility towards the State of Israel, but rather as adherence by Nigeria to a time-honoured principle to follow the path of integrity and also to maintain fairness to all parties. The provision of assistance that would afford Member States access to basic social services and the necessities of life should not be politicized. All the categories of States listed in paragraph 10 deserved to receive such assistance and the draft resolution should provide relevant United Nations staff with the necessary mandate for that purpose.

80. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.37 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 17: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(c) External debt sustainability and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.33 and A/C.2/71/L.60)

Draft resolutions on external debt sustainability and development (A/C.2/71/L.33 and A/C.2/71/L.60)

81. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.60, submitted by Mr. Andambi (Kenya), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.33. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

82. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.60 was adopted.*

83. **Mr. Fondukov** (Russian Federation), speaking in explanation of position, said that his delegation supported the consensus on the draft resolution. The development of rules-based debt structuring mechanisms helped to maintain the stability of the international financial system, which was in the interest of all Member States. It was important to use the unique capabilities of the United Nations, including its universal membership, to find timely and effective solutions to the issues contributing to growth in the indebtedness of developing countries. The dialogue that had begun with the adoption of the General Assembly resolution on basic principles of sovereign debt restructuring (A/RES/69/319) should continue. In that connection, it was regrettable that that resolution had not been mentioned in draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.60. The United Nations, in cooperation with the Bretton Woods institutions and other specialized international financial institutions, provided a unique forum for in-depth analysis of debt issues and for the development of comprehensive approaches that would take into account the interests of all parties concerned.

84. **Mr. Dolbow** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that, while his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it wished to make clear its views with respect to paragraph 20. The United States had long promoted consensual, orderly, sovereign debt restructuring efforts within a framework of contractual certainty. When contractual terms had to be

renegotiated, both creditors and sovereign debtors must work in a cooperative manner to negotiate a voluntary, consensual resolution, and restructuring negotiations must take place in a framework where creditors and debtors could seek recourse to the courts to enforce contractual terms. With regard to paragraph 23, his delegation reaffirmed its long-standing position that because international monetary, financial and trade institutions operated independently of the United Nations, it was inappropriate for resolutions of the General Assembly to opine on their operations.

85. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.33 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 23: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the Second United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2008-2017) (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.24 and A/C.2/71/L.55)

Draft resolutions on implementation of the second United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2008-2017) (A/C.2/71/L.24 and A/C.2/71/L.55)

86. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.55, submitted by Ms. Nipomici (Republic of Moldova), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.24. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

87. **Ms. Nipomici** (Republic of Moldova), speaking as facilitator for the draft resolution, said that, in the twelfth preambular paragraph, "the role of the Conference" should read "the role of UNCTAD" and "the Conference therefore has a role to play" should read "UNCTAD therefore has a role to play". In paragraph 17, "in particular for infrastructure and other investments" should read "notably for infrastructure and other investments". Those changes reflected what had been agreed by delegations during the informal consultations.

88. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.55, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

89. **Mr. Dolbow** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that his delegation was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution and was firmly committed to the eradication of poverty in all its forms. It noted, however, that the twenty-second preambular paragraph implied that States should comply with or implement various principles, standards or proposals related to the recovery and disposal of stolen assets that were not requirements under the United Nations Convention against Corruption and thus were not binding obligations on States parties. Furthermore, the citation of an aggregate percentage of gross national income in operative paragraph 21 implied that all developed countries had made the same commitment in regard to official development assistance. Although the United States was the largest single ODA provider, it was not committed to allocating a fixed percentage of its gross national income as ODA and viewed such targets as overly prescriptive. What mattered for true sustainable development was not ODA volume, but how effectively resources were used and how sustainable the results were. Accordingly, his delegation could not accept any interpretation of draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.55 that would mandate quantitative targets for country-specific aid or other assistance or that would impose new obligations on States.

90. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.24 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 25: Agriculture development, food security and nutrition (*continued*) (A/C.2/71/L.34 and A/C.2/71/L.56)

Draft resolutions on agriculture development, food security and nutrition (A/C.2/71/L.34 and A/C.2/71/L.56)

91. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.55, submitted by Ms. Nipomici (Republic of Moldova), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.34. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

92. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.56 was adopted.*

93. **Mr. Dolbow** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution in recognition of his country's ongoing support for the broader goal of worldwide food and nutrition security. However, its joining the consensus did not imply that it recognized any change in the current state of conventional or customary international law, including with regard to rights related to food. The United States was not a party to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and therefore the right to food was not an enforceable obligation for it. His delegation interpreted the draft resolution's references to the right to food and related rights with respect to States parties to the Covenant in light of its article 2, paragraph 1, and references to States' obligations regarding the right to food as applicable only to the extent they had assumed such obligations. It could not support any reading of the

draft resolution that suggested that the right to food created particular extraterritorial obligations. Furthermore, any reaffirmation of prior documents, positions or rights in the draft resolution applied only to those States that had already affirmed them.

94. **Mr. Plasai** (Thailand), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that progress towards sustainable agricultural practices everywhere was essential for eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, as well as for promoting economic growth, fostering social inclusion and preserving the environment. The transfer of environmentally sound technology for sustainable agriculture on favourable terms, including concessional and preferential terms, was critical. Farmers in the developing world, especially small-scale farmers, were among the poorest and most vulnerable groups, but if supported with adequate capacity and technology, they would have the potential to transform their production patterns into large-scale and commercial operations and to integrate production with food-processing, marketing and distribution in a complete agribusiness system.

95. The Group of 77 and China had worked hard and in good faith to ensure that the issue of technology transfer for sustainable agriculture was addressed in the draft resolution, and to that end, they had proposed agreed language from major intergovernmental outcome documents, including the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, the 2030 Agenda and "The future we want". However, to their great disappointment, their proposals had been systematically rejected. The Group of 77 and China were also deeply disappointed by the lack of commitment of some partner countries, and by the clear opposition of others, to their efforts to reach agreement on stronger or more concrete language in relation to outstanding issues concerning the Doha Declaration on Financing for Development. The Group wished to express serious concern about the lack of progress in the Doha Round of World Trade Organization negotiations and stress the necessity of their timely conclusion. A successful development-oriented outcome of the Doha Round would help to ensure growth in global trade and create new market access opportunities for developing countries. Lastly, the Group wished to make it clear that the inclusion of references to technology transfer for sustainable agriculture and to Doha-related issues would not have set any precedent for any future resolutions on agriculture development, food security, nutrition or other related issues.

96. *Draft resolution A/C.2/71/L.34 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 135: Programme planning

97. The Chair recalled that, at its second plenary meeting of the current session, the General Assembly had decided to allocate agenda item 135, entitled "Programme planning", to all the Main Committees as well as the plenary Assembly with a view to enhancing discussions of evaluation, planning, budgeting and monitoring reports. As no delegation had asked to speak on the item, he took it that the Committee did not wish to take any action on it.

98. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 121: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (A/C.2/71/L.64)

99. **The Chair** recalled that, during the seventieth session of the General Assembly, against the background of the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, as well as other ambitious outcomes, such as the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the Paris Agreement on climate change, many delegations had underlined the need for a new vision for the work of the Second Committee and, consequently, for a review and rationalization of the Committee's agenda and working methods. In early 2016 the Committee had held consultations on its agenda and methods of work and, while no formal outcome had been adopted, broad agreement had been reached on a number of points, in particular relating to working methods.

100. He had taken steps to implement a number of the proposed measures, such as initiating the preparations for the session, including agreement on a programme of work, at an early stage; reducing the number of side events; organizing the general discussions of all items in the first four weeks of the session; and identifying facilitators for the draft resolutions at an early stage. In addition, he had strictly applied the agreed time limits during the general debate and general discussions of individual agenda items, thereby reducing the number of meetings needed for general discussion. The Committee had set realistic deadlines for the submission of draft resolutions, including staggered deadlines for the submission of drafts under agenda item 19, accounting for nearly half the draft resolutions before the Committee, and an extension had been required only in the case of the draft resolution on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system. The Committee had maintained its traditional practice of adopting the vast majority of the draft resolutions before it by consensus; only 15 per

cent of its resolutions had been adopted by recorded vote. It was his impression that a positive atmosphere had prevailed among delegations throughout the session, both during the formal meetings and during informal consultations.

101. With regard to revitalization of the work of the General Assembly, he recalled that Assembly resolution 70/305 had called for continued consideration of biennialization, triennialization, clustering and elimination of agenda items, including through the introduction of a sunset clause. It had also called for continued effort to enhance synergies and coherence and reduce overlap in the agendas of the plenary Assembly, the Main Committees, the Economic and Social Council and its subsidiary bodies, and the high-level political forum on sustainable development as well as all other related forums. During the current session, the President of the Assembly had announced his intention to appoint co-facilitators to coordinate a process aimed at strategically aligning the agenda of future sessions with the 2030 Agenda. That process would build on the work begun during the seventieth session to enhance synergies and coherence and reduce overlap.

Draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the seventy-second session of the General Assembly (A/C.2/71/L.64)

102. **The Chair** drew attention to the draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the seventy-second session of the General Assembly, contained in document A/C.2/71/L.64. The draft programme of work contained no programme budget implications. He took it that the Committee wished to approve the draft programme of work.

103. *The draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the seventy-second session of the General Assembly was adopted.*

Completion of the Committee's work

104. **Mr. Hanif** (Director of the Office for ECOSOC Support and Coordination, Department of Economic and Social Affairs), speaking on behalf of Mr. Wu Hungbo, Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs, underlined the importance of the Committee's work for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and for efforts in respect of international migration and development, financing for development, poverty eradication, information and telecommunications technologies and the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system. He was certain that the comprehensive draft resolution adopted on the latter topic would help to ensure that the Organization was more fit for purpose in supporting work on the 2030 Agenda, and he was pleased to note that Member States had entrusted the Secretary-General designate with the development of concrete proposals and options in key areas that would contribute to the realization of the 2030 Agenda and enhance the support provided to Member States. The Department of Economic and Social Affairs remained committed to supporting the Committee in refining its work.

105. **The Chair** said that the strong work ethic demonstrated by Committee members and the evident spirit of trust among them had enabled the Committee to accomplish a great deal of work in an efficient manner. He was grateful to all members for their commitment, cooperation, flexibility and goodwill.

106. **Ms. Engelbrecht Schadtler** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) pointed out that her delegation had previously presented reservations and position statements about some aspects of the 2030 Agenda and the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and said that it wished to reiterate those reservations and positions in respect of all the draft resolutions adopted by the Committee during the current session.

107. **Mr. Plasai** (Thailand), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that, although the Group had submitted all but one of its proposed draft resolutions before the agreed deadlines, the Committee had not been able to conclude its work on time. General Assembly decision 65/530 remained relevant, but some amendments to its provisions might perhaps be made with the aim of enhancing the efficiency of the Committee's working methods and strengthening interactions between Member States and the Bureau. It was a matter of concern that during the current session, the Committee had not maintained its tradition of adopting draft resolutions by consensus. Indeed, that practice seemed to be in decline. On several occasions, views had been submitted under the no-objection procedure, and the draft resolution under agenda item 19 (a) had been put to a vote, mainly over the issue of periodicity. Furthermore, the issue of programme budget implications had been raised numerous times in the discussions on draft resolutions, causing delays in the negotiations and in the adoption of draft resolutions. The Group of 77 and China wished to recall that matters relating to the programme budget fell within the exclusive purview of the Fifth Committee. It also appealed to all Main Committees of the General Assembly to desist from using the phrase "within existing resources" in their draft resolutions, as

doing so ran counter to rule 153 of the Assembly's rules of procedure and numerous Assembly resolutions that had reaffirmed the role of the Fifth Committee.

108. Efforts to update and rationalize the agenda of the Second Committee in line with the new sustainable development framework should not necessarily lead to the elimination of items or change the periodicity with which they were considered. It was up to Member States to determine the priorities for the Committee's agenda in accordance with their development needs and interests. New issues relevant to the Sustainable Development Goals might warrant inclusion as new items on the agenda, including cross-cutting issues such as infrastructure, water, energy, industrialization, investment and sustainable consumption and production. Lastly, any streamlining of reporting should be avoided, as reporting strengthened informed decision-making and helped to build consensus among Member States.

109. *After an exchange of courtesies, the Chair declared that the Committee had completed its work for the seventy-first session.*

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.